



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,707	07/20/2000	David Greenblatt	194701US30	5304

22850 7590 03/15/2004

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHAW, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/575,707

Applicant(s)

GREENBLATT, DAVID

Examiner

Joseph D Shaw

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,11-13 and 15-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,11-13 and 15-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2141

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. Claims 28-30 recites the limitation "the whole document name" in lines 3 of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-13, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (6,104,711) in view of Blewett (5,835,718).

- a. As per claims 1-2, 5-6, and 11-12, Voit teaches name translation system containing a name server that receives a textual domain name (identifier) from clients and translates the identifier into a telephone number (Abstract; col. 4, lines 29-30). The telephone number is returned to the client so that the client can dial the number and

Art Unit: 2141

establish voice communications (col. 13, lines 51-62). However, Voit does not *explicitly* teach the identifier corresponding to electronic information being displayed to a user. Blewett teaches the well-known fact that URLs (identifiers) reference web pages (electronic information) and contain domain names (col. 1, lines 40-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include have the identifier taught in the name translation system of Voit be an identifier to electronic content, namely a URL of a web page containing a domain name, as taught by Blewett because it is well expected in the art that when a request for a web page is made, the domain name of the URL corresponding to the web page is translated by a name server.

b. As per claims 3, 7, and 13, Voit teaches the claimed invention modified above. Furthermore, Voit teaches the client machine communicating with the public switched telephone network gateway and initiating a telephone call through the central office (telephone switch; col. 14, lines 1-16).

c. As per claims 15, 17, 19, 21, and 25-26, Voit teaches name translation system containing a name server that receives a textual domain name (identifier) from clients and translates the identifier into a second identifier (telephone identifier; Abstract; col. 4, lines 29-30). The second identifier is returned to the client so that the client can establish voice communications (col. 13, lines 51-62). However, Voit does not *explicitly* teach the identifier corresponding to electronic information being displayed to a user. Blewett teaches the well-known fact that URLs (identifiers) reference web pages (electronic information) and contain domain names (col. 1, lines 40-47). It would

Art Unit: 2141

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include have the identifier taught in the name translation system of Voit be an identifier to electronic content, namely a URL of a web page containing a domain name, as taught by Blewett because it is well expected in the art that when a request for a web page is made, the domain name of the URL corresponding to the web page is translated by a name server.

3. Claims 16, 20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (6,104,711) in view of Blewett (5,835,718), and further in view of Mauger et al. (6,507,577).

d. As per claims 16, 20, and 22-23, Voit teaches the claimed invention modified above. However, the modified Voit invention does not explicitly teach the voice communications channel comprising a voice-over-IP (i.e. VoIP) connection. Mauger teaches that voice services over the Internet (VoIP) are being looked at to replace conventional PSTN voice communications (col. 1, lines 9-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the PSTN communications in the modified Voit invention with the VoIP communications over the Internet (Wide Area Network) taught by Mauger because voice services over the Internet can be provided at costs significantly less than conventional PSTN, as taught by Mauger (col. 1, lines 9-21).

4. Claims 18, 24, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (6,104,711) in view of Blewett (5,835,718), and further in view of Mattaway et al. (6,275,490).

e. As per claims 18, 24, and 27, Voit teaches the claimed inventions modified above. However, the modified Voit invention does not

Art Unit: 2141

explicitly teach visually identifying to a user, without a user request, that a second identifier is known for the electronic information being displayed to the user. Mattaway teaches identifying separate address or destination information on a web page allowing the user to establish a separate channel of communications (col. 1, lines 45-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include visually identifying to the user, without a user request, that a second identifier is known for the electronic information being displayed, as taught by Mattaway, in the modified Voit invention because it provides a user-friendly interface that negates the need for the user to manually search for alternate communication methods.

5. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (6,104,711) in view of Blewett (5,835,718), and further in view of Hughes (6,308,219).

f. As per claims 28-30, Voit teaches the claimed inventions modified above. However, the modified Voit invention does not explicitly teach the second identifier being obtained by finding a longest matching sub-string in a database without requiring the whole document name to be found in the database. Hughes teaches a method of routing data where a large possible number of destinations exist and routing takes place by associating a destination with the longest sub-string of the destination address in the packet (col. 1, lines 27-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the idea of longest matching sub-string to relate two pieces of data, as taught by Hughes, in the Voit invention because relating to the longest matching sub-string allows for

Art Unit: 2141

ultimately ending up at the most relevant information (destination) for the sub-string provided, allowing for branching tree algorithms in data searches, as disclosed by Hughes (col. 1, lines 40-63).

Still, there the modified Voit invention is silent with respect to searching a database for the substring. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of having a database to store information and later search through to retrieve the information are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a database in the modified Voit invention because databases are common data storage and retrieval methods.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-7, and 11-13, specifically applicant's arguments with respect to motivation for combinations, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. In response to applicant's argument that the Voit patent (the '711 patent) is directed toward a different problem than the claimed invention, the Examiner would like to point out that centrality of either invention is not considered in the claims. Applicant's claims are directed towards a computer program, a method, and a telecommunications system that contains some limitations met by the Voit patent.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D Shaw whose telephone number

Art Unit: 2141

is 703-305-0094. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday and alternate Fridays, 7am - 4pm.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharra can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph Shaw
Examiner
AU 2141



LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER